

ROUGH DRAFT, DAVID CHAPMAN, 4-6-09

Page 1

1 (Whereupon, the deposition began at  
2 8:35 a.m.)

3 VIDEOGRAPHER: We are now on the record for  
4 the deposition of David Chapman. Today is April  
5 6th, 2009. The time is 8:35 a.m. Counsel please  
6 identify yourselves for the Record?

08:35AM

7 MR. DEIHL: I'm Colin Deihl representing  
8 Cargill.

9 MR. HIXON: Philip Hixon representing  
10 Peterson Farms:

08:36AM

11 MS. XIDIS: Claire Xidis for the State of  
12 Oklahoma.

13 MS. MOLL: Ingrid Moll for the State of  
14 Oklahoma.

15 MS. BRONSON: Vicki Bronson for Simmons  
16 Food.

08:36AM

17 DAVID CHAPMSN  
18 having first been duly sworn to testify the truth,  
19 the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testified  
20 as follows:

21 DIRECT EXAMINATION

22 BY MR. DEIHL:

23 Q Mr. Chapman, please state your full name for  
24 the Record.

25 A David John Chapman.

08:36AM

Draft Copy

ROUGH DRAFT, DAVID CHAPMAN, 4-6-09

Page 141

1 people what's their willingness to pay to undo a  
2 problem that they have been forced to endure, and so  
3 this describes the undoing of the problem.

4 Q And do you know if the problem can be undone  
5 by adding alum, by doing these alum treatments that  
6 you've described to the respondents?

02:17PM

7 A Me personally do I know?

8 Q Yes.

9 A I do not know personally.

10 Q Did the team reach a conclusion about whether  
11 or not the alum treatments would return the water to  
12 the clarity that's described in your survey?

02:17PM

13 A No, we reached a conclusion that presenting  
14 this information to the respondents at this time in  
15 the survey helped us measure what we were trying to  
16 measure, which is the individual's willingness to  
17 pay undo the problem.

02:18PM

18 Q If the problem couldn't be undone, would that  
19 affect your survey results?

20 A I don't think so but I'd have to think some  
21 more about that but as I sit here today, I don't  
22 think so.

02:18PM

23 Q So even if it was simply false, that adding  
24 alum, doing these alum treatments -- strike that.

25 Even if doing this alum program that you've

02:19PM

Draft Copy

ROUGH DRAFT, DAVID CHAPMAN, 4-6-09

Page 142

1 described wouldn't return the water to the clarity  
2 levels of 1960, it wouldn't make any difference to  
3 the outcome of your survey?

4 MS. XIDIS: Objection to form.

5 A There were multiple questions in there. I'm 02:19PM  
6 trying to figure out which ones to answer.

7 (Whereupon, the court reporter read  
8 back the previous question.)

9 A What matters is what the respondents  
10 understood. What matters is what the respondents 02:19PM  
11 understood and did the respondents understand that  
12 the water clarity could be returned. If the

13 respondents, which we think we did a very good job  
14 in describing the situation, describing effects and  
15 understanding how they reacted to that fix. That 02:20PM  
16 was fix not effects, as long as the respondents took  
17 this as being a plausible scenario to return the  
18 water clarity back to the conditions they cared  
19 about, then whether or not it was actually a program  
20 that could be actually implemented in this time 02:20PM  
21 frame wouldn't change those results.

22 Q So if I understood you correctly, you're  
23 telling me that there does not need to be a factual  
24 basis for undoing the harm?

25 A There needs to be a plausible basis to the 02:20PM